



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ine worth. Nor again is there any one constructive policy put forth in the book. Each writer calls for something to be done in his own special branch of education, but does this not bring us much further out of the general "Education Muddle?"

Again it is difficult to see on what principle these essays are selected. They do not touch on all important subjects in the field of Education, nor do they deal adequately with any one. For instance, the vexed question of the relation of the Church to the Schools and of the place of religion in education is dealt with in a merely polemical spirit and by an author who is dominated by ecclesiastical bias and party feeling. In short, we are left after reading these essays with a number of unanswered problems and a sense that the most serious difficulties have been barely touched upon.

It is particularly important that writers on education should avoid the faults of want of thoroughness and superficiality which are so commonly found in the treatment of this subject.

The clamor for more technical and commercial education seems to be generally actuated by this same superficiality of outlook, and there seems to be a grave danger of its producing like superficial results. What is needed above all things is to make people think. Given a nation of men and women who can think hard and industriously search for truth and surely all subsidiary aims of education will be fulfilled. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of Heaven and all these things will be added unto you." How to make people think and to care about truth is the real difficulty in education and one which ought to be dealt with earnestly by all teachers.

A. D. SANGER.

LONDON.

PRINCIPLES OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION. By Benjamin Kidd.  
London; Macmillan & Co. Pp. 518.

A writer who attempts to give a theory of civilization in Europe and America sets himself a task involving an encyclopædic knowledge. It is not only questionable whether any living person has that knowledge; it may be also doubted whether Mr. Kidd's method is a right one. According to Mr. Kidd there cannot be a true science of human life and progress apart by itself. "There cannot be, we must understand, such a science regarded

as an isolated section of knowledge; or in any other sense than as a department of higher biology" (p. 31). But can the view of the history of the world as the realization of a moral purpose throughout the ages be established as an empirical induction from the facts of history? The problem is so vast that any induction from historical facts within our knowledge may not give us the slightest rational presumption in favor of any particular solution. The interpretation of history is a problem for philosophy, the solution of which will depend upon a philosophical theory of knowledge and morality. In short, evolution itself needs to be explained.

Apart from any such preliminary objection as the above, it cannot be said that Mr. Kidd has anything new and true to tell us. His whole book is devoted to the demonstration of "the profound antinomy" between the interests of the present and the future. "We begin to see that in so ultimate and fundamental a matter as the average duration of life in the individual, the determining and controlling end, towards which Natural Selection has operated, must have been, not simply the benefit of the individual, nor even of his contemporaries, in a mere struggle for existence in the present, but a larger advantage, probably always far in the future, to which the individual and the present alike were subordinated. This extended view taken of the operation of the law of Natural Selection, and the consequent shifting into a region no longer bounded by the conception of advantage to existing individuals of the end towards which Natural Selection works, marks the departure we are considering" (pp. 48-9). This is Mr. Kidd's "great antinomy." It is the ascendancy of the future over the present. Mr. Kidd hails this as a great discovery. But when stripped of its setting in a rich vocabulary of adjectives, it seems to mean nothing more than the old conflict between egoism and altruism, a question as old as that of free will. It is in Weismann's theory of Natural Selection that Mr. Kidd finds revealed this antinomy between the interests of the present generation and the interests of future unborn generations. Mr. Kidd seems to assume, rather than to prove, that Natural Selection is the only factor in the process of evolution. What of the dissent from Weismannism which we find in such writers as Mr. Spencer, not to mention Mr. A. Russell Wallace and others? Mr. Kidd is contemptuous of Mr. Spencer. "Of that deeper conception of human progress as an integrating social process, of which all the principles are in the last resort

controlled by the fact that the present is in reality not so much related to the past as passing out under the control of the future, there is to be distinguished no grasp in Mr. Spencer's writings" (p. 83). Mr. Kidd's contempt is not confined to Mr. Spencer. Mr. Huxley's famous Romanes Lecture makes an "entirely superficial" distinction between "the cosmic process and the ethical process" (p. 31). As the evolutionist "rises from the study of Mill's writings, the superficiality of the whole system of ideas represented profoundly impresses his mind" (p. 77). "The comparisons which Grote instituted between ancient and modern Democracy—the ideas involved in which may be traced through the phase of thought represented in the modern utilitarian movement—are entirely superficial" (p. 191). We read also of "that notorious theory of population propounded by Malthus—socially suicidal, and biologically foolish" (p. 411). But it is unnecessary to detail further instances of Mr. Kidd's contempt for other thinkers, a contempt which is displayed throughout the whole book. Contemptuous epithets are not arguments.

Taking for granted the truth of Weismannism—a rather large assumption with which to begin a system of evolutionary philosophy—and apparently oblivious of the difference that must exist between human and pre-human evolution and which is all the difference between man and the lower animals, Mr. Kidd, with that love of broad generalization which leads people so often away from fact, divides the evolution of human society into two stages. "In the first epoch of social development the characteristic and ruling feature is the supremacy of the causes which are contributing to social efficiency by subordinating the individual merely to the existing political organization" (p. 140). The Greek and Roman civilization was, according to Mr. Kidd, organized in the interests of the present in the ancient world. This is hardly a correct representation of the Greek or Roman State. It is no doubt true, as we find in Plato, that the individual was subordinated to the state of which he was a member. The state was regarded as everything. But this subordination is not the subordination of the future to the present. Indeed it is the very reverse. The state was a corporation which had an immortal existence; and in identifying himself with his state, the Greek citizen was realizing himself as an active member of the corporate whole, the interests of which necessarily extended into the distant future. But characteristic as this identification of the indi-

vidual and the state was of Greek thought and life, one must not forget the cosmopolitanism of the Stoics. One formula will not express the tendency of an epoch in social history, or, if it does, it will do it badly.

"In the second epoch of human society we begin to be concerned with the rise to ascendancy of the ruling causes, which contribute to a higher type of social efficiency by subordinating society itself with all its interests in the present to its own future" (p. 142). In the sudden development of Christianity Mr. Kidd finds a challenge of the ascendancy of the present. He traces "the development of the great antinomy" through the breaking up of the old Greek and Roman world, and through the Middle Ages down to the present time. This is perhaps the more interesting part of his book. But though it shows wide reading on Mr. Kidd's part and even suggestiveness of thought, one parts from the book with disappointment. The fact is that Mr. Kidd misconceives the ideas of Christianity. The future with which Christianity deals, is not so much the future of this world as that future beyond death in which time shall be no more. In this way it also insists upon the importance of the present as partaking of the Infinite. We must remember that the Kingdom of God is within us. It has been indicated above that Mr. Kidd's "great antinomy" amounts to nothing more than the old conflict betwixt altruism and egoism. But to speak strictly it seems to have no less than three different meanings: (1) At the outset of the book, and indeed throughout the greater part of it, it means the conflict between the interests of the present generation and the interests of future unborn generations. (2) But in discussing ancient society Mr. Kidd confuses this conflict with that between the individual and the state. (3) Lastly he identifies the future with the Infinite in his account of Christianity. Such an Infinite is the mere endlessness, the going on forever, against which Hegel uttered such a strong protest. This may be a mistaken interpretation of Mr. Kidd's words. But he constantly uses phrases into which it is very difficult to put an exact meaning. This book is however the first volume of a system of evolutionary philosophy. So in another or others Mr. Kidd may tell us what exactly the principle of "projected efficiency" is when interpreted in terms of human life. He has hitherto left the reader in the dark.

W. F. TROTTER.

EDINBURGH.